

1961

marine could be ready for sea would be August of 1965 with a delivery gap of 9 months. If the date were March, the gap would be 10 months. If it were May of 1962—and this is more reasonable—the gap would be a full 12 months. Is this orderly long-range planning? Does it make sense to expand our production facilities to "one per month" and then cut it off for a full year? Is not this procurement in "fits", gasps, and "spurts"?

Mr. Chairman, I repeat, it is clear that the long leadtime items cannot be acquired under the terms of section 412(b) of the Military Construction Act of 1959 for any boats except those authorized in this bill.

It is clear that if a one-per-month schedule is to be maintained, the long leadtime items for the 30th and succeeding boats must be funded in fiscal year 1962. Without authorization in S. 1852, they cannot be funded in fiscal year 1962.

Therefore, no matter how we look at it, and no matter how much we point with pride to the Kennedy acceleration, we will have a Polaris delivery gap of 1 year and a disruption of the one-per-month schedule.

During the hearings on H.R. 6151, there was much concern expressed over the fact that no authorization for new manned bombers was requested. The entire committee, including myself, felt that failure to authorize additional bombers could be interpreted as the total adoption by the Congress of the missile concept and the final rejection of the bomber concept. A great deal of concern was expressed that assembly lines manufacturing the B-52 and B-58 bombers would be closed down and that orderly procurement would stop. As a result, we authorized additional bombers.

Although it is true that S. 1852 does contain authorization for more Polaris submarines while the original bill contained no authorization for bombers, the two situations are comparable insofar as the maintenance of orderly production is concerned. Achieving the one-per-month schedule of Polaris deliveries and then stopping it for 1 year does as much violence to the orderly production of ships as no new authorization would have done for bombers. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the same argument successfully applied for bombers should be applied for Polaris submarines.

I do not wish to tie the present administration to the policy of its predecessors, nor to the previous planning of naval experts. But additional authorization of six Polaris submarines in S. 1852 will not do this. It only provides insurance against delay while the new administration is determining its own policy regarding the number of submarines we should eventually build. The funding of long leadtime items in fiscal year 1962 could not possibly be a waste even if the decision was finally made to terminate the Polaris program at the 29th boat. The items are identical with those which can be used in other nuclear submarines. The administration would not be committed to request funding nor would the Appropriations

Committee be committed to granting it. It would merely be an insurance policy which would preserve the gains of the Kennedy acceleration without building in the deceleration presently contained in S. 1852.

I am not enough of an expert to say how many of these submarines should be built. But in the absence of testimony to the contrary, I must accept the clear case which has been built over the years for a fleet of 45. I have every hope that the present Secretary of Defense will see the wisdom in the program recommended by experts and eventually recommend such a fleet. But, in the meantime, we should not tie his hands so that he is forced to lose a full year in achieving his recommendation when he makes it.

I only recommend additional authorization. Without it we cannot achieve a strength of 45 boats without the loss of a year's time. With the authorization we do not procure a single item which will be wasted. My plea is for time which, once lost, can never be regained.

Long-range planning is essential for our Defense Establishment. Let us not plan in fits, jumps, and spurts. Let us give the Department of Defense the chance to continue orderly procurement. We must authorize six additional fleet ballistic missile submarines in this bill.

Mr. Charman, at the appropriate time, I shall offer an amendment authorizing six additional Polaris submarines.

The issues involved in my amendment are quite clear.

First of all, do we want a Polaris gap of 1 year?

Secondly, will we nullify a dramatic acceleration with a 1-year deceleration?

Thirdly, when there is no risk of waste, can we afford not to be sure?

And lastly, are we going to allow an interruption of 1 full year in the orderly procurement schedule we have fought so hard to achieve?

At the appropriate time, I earnestly hope the House will support my amendment.

*Cuba file*  
**Castro's Extortion**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. STYLES BRIDGES**

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record editorials from two outstanding newspapers in the Nation—one which appeared in the Boston Herald, Boston, Mass., May 22 entitled "Millions for Tribute," and the other entitled "Castro's Extortion" from the May 23 edition of the Oakland Tribune, Oakland, Calif., which is published by our former colleague, William Knowland.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, May 23, 1961]

#### CASTRO'S EXTORTION

"Millions for defense, but not 1 cent for tribute," sums up a philosophy deeply ingrained in Americans and in the political tradition of the United States.

It was first enunciated in the early days of the Republic and means flatly and categorically that the United States will always resist international blackmail, subtle or overt.

Because we have been raised in this tradition and used it as a guidepost in our foreign relations for nearly two centuries, is why Castro's extortion attempt is so dangerous.

Castro's brazen demand for bulldozers and tractors in exchange for the pitiful freedom fighters he now holds up for ransom is doubly dangerous because the American public has always put their hearts before their pocketbooks. They have always favored the underdog.

But consider these questions:

What if Castro had asked for commercial airliners or cargo ships instead of farm equipment. The logic is the same and remember that Cuba squats only 90 miles from our American shores.

Perhaps more important, however, is the effect that making a blackmail payment to Cuba would have on the cadre chiefs in the international Communist conspiracy.

Would it not be interpreted as a show of fear on the part of America, a position of weakness, and a clear example that we have abandoned our opposition to paying tribute? The answer, of course, is a strongly affirmative "Yes."

It must also be remembered that the effects will be the same whether the tractors and bulldozers are paid for through the generous donations of a sympathetic American public—the anti-Castro Cubans now in the United States, or the U.S. Defense Department.

It would mean that any time a Communist-inspired coup was successful anywhere in the world, Americans would be seized and held for ransom. Where would it end?

Before any commitment is made to ransom these men—however gallant their undertaking—the American public must search deeply into its collective conscience and consider the real eventual price it will pay by giving in to this present blackmail.

No one can help but sympathize deeply with the plight of the prisoners and understand the selfless desires of the mercy fund organization being formed on nonpartisan lines to rescue them.

What we are suggesting is that the men-for-machines swap has far deeper and fundamental implications for Americans and our country than merely raising a few million dollars to pay off a kidnaper.

[From the Boston Herald, May 22, 1961]

#### MILLIONS FOR TRIBUTE

Once upon a time there was a small but proud nation that refused to buy protection from anyone. When a piratical country several thousand miles away seized its ships and demanded ransom, the small nation fitted out a fleet and blew the pirates off the map.

Its motto then was, "Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute."

A century and a half later the small nation had grown rich and powerful. But when a piratical neighbor 90 miles off its coast seized persons under its protection and demanded a ransom of 500 tractors for their safe return, it couldn't make up its mind what to do.

Finally a group of leading citizens announced that it would raise the ransom price. It sent a telegram to the pirate leader saying that it was paying the tribute out of humanity toward the prisoners and "a deep

A3780

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 25

sense of friendship" for the rank-and-file pirates. The government, relieved to have the decision taken out of its hands, agreed to facilitate the export of the ransom takers.

The arrangement naturally pleased the pirates, who were anxious to cultivate such profitable friendships. When the ransom was paid they turned over the prisoners, only slightly the worse for wear, and then looked around for more friends of the rich and powerful country whom they could seize and hold for ransom. Indeed, the thing looked so good that everybody began grabbing prisoners and sending off ransom notes.

Soon the rich and powerful nation was poor and small again. But it was a long time before it recovered its pride.

**Murder Is Not a Childish Prank**

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. BRUCE ALGER**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, it is time we faced up to the fact that coddling criminals because they happen to also be teenagers is not the answer to so-called juvenile delinquency. There is a difference between breaking windows and committing murder. Our laws must recognize serious crime for what it is if we are to meet and solve one of America's gravest problems:

## GETTING AWAY WITH MURDER

On reading President Kennedy's proposals for a federally directed "total attack" on juvenile delinquency, a responsible parent may wonder whether he and Mr. Kennedy are worrying about the same thing.

The President, it seems to us, has missed an opportunity to inject some clarity into the discussion of a fogbound subject, perhaps because he misses the point of the Nation's concern. Nowhere in his remarks is the euphemism "juvenile delinquency" pulled apart to reveal the multitude of evils it embraces.

What alarms a community is not truancy, window breaking, and apple filching. It is robbery, rape, and murder, committed by criminals who happen also to be teenagers or even younger. And "criminal" is the exact word. In New York City the other day, a 15-year-old stabbed to death a 14-year-old he had never seen before. His explanation: "He got snotty." This was the seventh youth gang murder in that section of the city this year, and the fourth in just 17 days.

In too many places, the merely wayward youngster and the truly dangerous youth alike have enjoyed society's impartial solicitude. In the face of alarming evidence to the contrary, the sentimental assumption persists that every young hoodlum can be redeemed if society will only love and understand him. But this turns the issue upside-down. The necessity for understanding does not rest with society, but with the young criminal who is contemptuous of its rules.

The remedy for the worsening problem of juvenile crime does not lie mainly in more study, workshops or projects. Indeed, there is no pat solution. But a big step toward a solution would surely be for all communities to draw the line between delinquency and crime.

No community needs Federal help to make that commonsense distinction. Those com-

munities which let young criminals literally get away with murder are already shirking their responsibilities. If they let Washington try to take over the problem, they are abdicating their responsibilities.

**Memorial Day**

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 25, 1961

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, this is our Memorial Day around the world. Memorial Day, May 30, is distinctly an American institution. It is a deeply significant, sentimental custom established by our people more than 90 years ago.

The American Memorial Day is being observed in every community across our Nation, also in many foreign lands upon the high seas.

This special day is the brief moment we set aside from our busy lives to pause before the resting places of our departed loved ones—to remember them and to eulogize the honored dead. This is the day of tribute to those who live only in history.

When we have concluded our short ceremonies here and turn back to our daily tasks, we shall leave with the dead our tributes, expressed in words and with flowers. But of even greater import is the fact that we, ourselves, will have gained new spiritual and mental enlightenment through this experience.

This is not a day for sadness. In fact, when we consider all of its facets, we find that Memorial Day has great beauty and that it has truly inspiring depths.

There are the colors of our flag and flowers for the eye to admire. There are the carefully chosen words of prose, poetry, song, and prayer for the ear to hear. All these touch our hearts and minds and our conscience. They reawaken in us a new realization that we are influenced in large measure by those who have gone before us, and by their contributions to our lives.

It does not matter who we are, nor the differences between our religious thinking on racial stock. The principles represented by this Memorial Day are the same to each of us. We are all Americans. This is our special day, and here we stand together in tribute to our own national family.

Following the same line of thought, when we honor the dead we do not weigh the stations they held in life. It does not matter whether they were rich or poor, young or old, whether they were intellectuals, craftsmen, students, or laborers. At the poet John Ingalls expressed it, in the democracy of the dead, all men at last are equal. There is neither rank nor station nor prerogative in the republic of the grave.

In those days of combat, it did not matter who our fellow defenders were. And so it is now in our homage to them. It makes no difference whether they

were native sons or the foreign born, whether they were white or black or brown, gentiles or Jews, Protestants or Catholics. In the final analysis, all that has ever counted is the fact that they were Americans and that they gave their lives in the defense of our homes and of our ideals of freedom.

Now, it may be a little difficult for us who are gathered here to realize that we are part of a vast, worldwide, commemorative service on this special day. We are but a small portion of the living who are honoring the dead. And these souls to whom we are directing our immediate attention are but a very few of the total number of American honored dead around the world.

What we are doing here is actually symbolic. Our contribution to the overall Memorial Day observance is being duplicated by millions of other people throughout our land and in several foreign countries. To make the point clear, let us consider the following facts:

There are more than 1 million names on the honor rolls of the American war dead. Those are the men who have fought and died for our country since this Nation was founded some 185 years ago.

What we say here today expresses our tribute to all of those honored ones. The praise we give the other departed war veterans of our personal acquaintance is, in reality, praise for all who have served in the Armed Forces of our Nation.

We cannot return the dead, therefore the only remaining course is to extend ourselves to them through the sincerity and beauty of our memorial services. That is what our people are doing today at home and abroad. Let us look at the whole picture for a moment.

Throughout the United States and in some 25 American military cemeteries beyond our shores, the mortal remains of some 400,000 Americans who gave their lives in World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict are buried—or they are recorded as missing in action.

On this Memorial Day, special ceremonies are being held at 8 American military cemeteries or special memorials in France, England, and Belgium, where nearly 31,000 World War I dead are buried.

Similar services are being held for 76,000 World War II dead at 14 other American cemeteries in England, France, Belgium, Luxembourg, Holland, Italy, and Tunisia.

Also, special services are being held for more than 90,000 other World War II and Korean war dead buried or recorded as missing at American cemeteries in Puerto Rico, Hawaii, Alaska, and the Philippines.

In addition, special services are being held for the war dead at the Tomb of the Unknowns and some 99,000 other war dead buried at Arlington National Cemetery, on Virginia soil, across the Potomac from Washington, D.C.

Most of these final resting places are a long way from us. But, in reality, they are very close to our hearts.

One of the ablest research men whom I observed working in the Senate in my years of service, a keen student, a thorough preparer of material for the committee who leaves no stone remain unturned in his search for answers, is Charles Lee.

To him, again in behalf of the committee, I express my appreciation. I am proud of the fact that Charles Lee holds a masters degree in political science from the University of Minnesota. He has a long record of outstanding service in my State and also has a great war record, something about which we never hear him talk. But it is a war record which is deeply moving when it is fully known. He is a resident of Portland, Oreg., and I am proud to call him a fellow Oregonian and a constituent of mine.

On the Republican side of the staff, I express my appreciation again to Mike Bernstein and Ray Hurley, who were most capable assistants, not only to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], and the other Republican members of the subcommittee; but who, when we sometimes needed help from them even on our side of the aisle, to check up on the material which was put into the Record by the Senator from Arizona, for example, always gave us whatever facts we needed in relation to the material which was being used by the Republicans. They recognized that that, too, was their duty, just as it was the duty of the representatives of the majority side of the committee.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare made available to us at all times one of their experts, Mr. Dave Martin. I express the committee's appreciation for his excellent work.

Other members of the staff of the full committee assisted us. I desire to thank especially Mr. Stewart McClure, the chief clerk.

I wish to thank another research assistant, from my office Miss Phyllis Rock.

Then we come to the floor of the Senate. We have seen these wonderful staff members assisting the members of the committee from the very beginning of the debate. I desire that the Record show our appreciation to Mr. Baker, Mr. McDonald, Mr. Gibbons, Mr. McPherson, and all their associates on the Senate floor staff.

Nor could we have produced the bill, which I think time will prove to be a sound bill, if we had not had the cooperation of the White House staff and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I express my thanks particularly to Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Abraham Ribicoff and to his keen and scholarly assistant, Mr. Wilbur J. Cohen.

In my judgment, the bill never would have come to us in the acceptable form in which it was passed tonight if the White House staff, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and his assistants had not been willing to meet with us frequently, sometimes at the White House, sometimes at the office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and

Welfare, sometimes in the office of the majority leader, and sometimes in the committee room itself. On those occasions, we hammered out a bill on the basis of conscientious adjustment of those differences of opinion which develop in the consideration of a bill as complex as this bill.

One of the things of which I shall always be proud, and of which I think the committee can be proud, is that we could come to the floor of the Senate and say to the Senate, "We are presenting a bill which has the approval not only of its sponsors and those who voted to report it from committee, but also the approval of the officials of the administration."

That cannot be done frequently in the Senate. If Senators want my opinion as to one of the major reasons why it was possible to pass the bill, defeating every amendment which was offered which we wanted defeated, accepting only two amendments with which we were in complete agreement, and which we decided we wanted adopted after the bill had been reported from the committee, it was that we had the administration behind us, both at the White House level and at the level of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Record should show this, because if it did not show it, I do not know how my very deep and appreciative feelings and really sentimental reaction could be made a part of this historic record.

Only part of all the nice things that have been said about the work we have done are deserved. In that connection I wish to say that a very great deal of the credit is due the chief sponsor of the bill in the House of Representatives, Representative THOMPSON of New Jersey. Today I received a call from the White House and also a call from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and was told that the administration refers to this bill as the Morse-Thompson bill—Representative THOMPSON, of New Jersey, having had the responsibility of the leadership on the House side, in connection with the bill.

I wish to thank the administration for what I consider to be its exceedingly generous expression. It is really a tribute due all the members of the two committees, the one in the Senate and the other in the House of Representatives.

Probably I have failed to express my appreciation to some I have overlooked; but, if so, it is certainly unintentional.

To all who have helped, I am deeply grateful; and I may say I am particularly grateful to the 48 Senators who joined me on the rollcall vote and to those who joined me on live pairs.

Mr. President, my good friend, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] has now left the Chamber. However, earlier today he obtained a print of this bill which was made after the enrolling clerk of the Senate sent the bill to the Government Printing Office last night, after the third reading of the bill. My friend, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and my friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], had a little sport with me tonight, in the course of the debate; they ribbed me a little. They

said that apparently a new procedure had been adopted, and indicated that perhaps I had become subject to overconfidence and had engaged in some irregularity, because today there arrived on Capitol Hill a print of Senate bill 1021 which bears the notation—"Passed the Senate May 25, 1961." They pointed out that that notation had been printed on the bill even before the bill had actually been put to a record vote in the Senate.

I did not know anything about the printing procedures; so, as the Record will show, I said I did not know about it; but that I would find out, and that it was not done on any orders or authorization of mine. I said I was sure it was not a substantive matter, but no doubt was one of common procedure.

Now I have ascertained the facts, and the Record should show them, so that those who read the Record will not be left in doubt, and so there will be no question about the propriety of the course of action which was followed.

The enrolling clerk of the Senate, who has been employed by the Senate for 30 years, advises me that the procedure which was followed last night, after the third reading, in sending the bill to the Government Printing Office for printing, is a practice of 30 years' standing. I am sure that my friend, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and my friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], will be glad to have that enlightening information, just as I am glad to have it. They will be pleased to know that no irregularity at all was followed. The enrolling clerk of the Senate informs me that the practice is to send the bill to the Government Printing Office immediately after the third reading of the bill, so that a so-called "clean copy" of the bill can be printed. Then it can at once be placed in the hands of the legislative counsel, so that he can do his work on the bill before it goes to the House of Representatives. The enrolling clerk points out that the moment such a print of the bill is available, it is available for signature by the Secretary of the Senate. But it is signed by him only after the bill is passed by the Senate, and this printed copy is actually effective only after it has been signed by the Secretary of the Senate. Of course, the copy which the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Illinois had obtained bore no signature at all; but I imagine that the bill has now been signed and is on its way to the House of Representatives, because, after all, the bill has now been passed.

Although I imagine that much of what my two friends said was said in humor and in the process of indulging in good fun, nevertheless they made a serious point about the matter, and I wanted the Record to show the facts in regard to it.

*Cuba file*  
**OLD MISTAKE REPEATED IN CUBA**

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "An Old Mistake Repeated in Cuba." The article was published today in the Washington

## NOT VOTING—33

Anderson	Gore	Neuberger
Blackley	Gruening	Prouty
Bush	Hickenlooper	Robertson
Byrd, Va.	Humphrey	Russell
Cannon	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Capehart	Kerr	Schoeppel
Carlson	Long, La.	Smathers
Chavez	Magnuson	Sparkman
Dodd	McCarthy	Symington
Eastland	McClellan	Talmadge
Ellender	McGee	Yarborough

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, earlier in the day the majority leader indicated that there would be a session tomorrow, at which time we would consider the calendar of measures to which there is no objection. I should like to know whether that is still what he proposes to do, and whether or not after the conclusion of business tomorrow he intends to have the Senate adjourn for the remainder of the week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senate has ordered that tomorrow there shall be a call of the calendar to consider items on the calendar to which there is no objection. The rest of the day will be taken up with speeches by various Members. Then it is our intention to go over from Friday until Monday, at which time no action that I know of will be taken; if it is, certainly it will be noncontroversial. It is planned to adjourn from Monday until Thursday. I suggest that Members return by Thursday, because the Senate may have legislation before it at that time which will demand close attention.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the majority leader.

## EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION BY SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I would not want the RECORD to close without taking some time to express my appreciation for the wonderful assistance I received throughout the consideration of the Federal-aid-to-education bill, starting from the day the bill was referred to my Subcommittee on Education until the historic hour this evening when the bill was passed by such a fine majority of 49 to 34. Mr. Baker advises me that if all Senators had been present, the bill would have been passed by a vote of 59 to 41.

Many of my colleagues have been kind enough to express very flattering words about my work on the bill. Every Senator knows that no one person carries a bill through the Senate. The bill was carried through the Senate not by any leadership alone, but by the efforts of all who have cooperated with me and worked so hard with me from the time we first considered the bill in my subcommittee.

It is always dangerous to start thanking some persons for services rendered far beyond the line of duty, without running the risk of forgetting someone else. However, I will run that risk in order to make certain that the RECORD will show that credit is given to some to whom I shall always be indebted for their wonderful cooperation.

There would have been no chance for the passage of the bill if we had not received at all times the complete cooperation of the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I am sure that few Members of the Senate fully appreciate the great help the Senator from Montana was to the boys and girls of this country in connection with the magnificent work he did in helping to clear the way for the final consideration of the bill today. In behalf of my subcommittee I say to the Senator from Montana that we thank him very much.

I also wish to express my sincere thanks to the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the incomparable Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. We all know that no matter how hard a subcommittee may work on a piece of legislation, if the subcommittee cannot receive the complete cooperation of the chairman of the full committee, any bill the subcommittee seeks to bring out is headed for rough travel through the parliamentary procedures of the Senate. The Senator from Alabama has been one of the great friends of Federal aid to education ever since I first came to the Senate, starting back in 1947, when the Senate first considered the bill that year, followed by the bill of 1949, and again last year, by S. 8. The Senator from Alabama has long been of great help in the area of Federal aid to education just as he has been one of the great proponents of Federal aid to various health and hospital projects. One of the great pieces of legislation on the statute books, known as the Hill-Burton Act, has caused us frequently to refer to LISTER HILL as probably the greatest friend the people of the country have in the Senate in connection with health legislation.

I express my sincere thanks, too, to all the members of the subcommittee. The senior member of the subcommittee is the very wonderful Senator from Michigan, PAT McNAMARA. Never at any time during the consideration of the bill, either in committee or on the floor of the Senate, did I ask any help from Senator McNAMARA and not get it in overflowing measure. I want him to know that I deeply appreciate his help, as I appreciate also the help of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the other Democratic members of the subcommittee.

Moreover, there would have been no chance of voting on the bill tonight if we had not had the understanding assistance—although they did not agree with us in some particulars on some parts of the bill—of every Republican member of the committee. I express my appreciation to the Senator from New

York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], who voted in the subcommittee and in the full committee to report the bill.

Although he is not a member of the committee, I want to voice my thanks, also, to the Senator from Montana, LEE METCALF, who is now presiding over the Senate. As a Member of the House of Representatives, he was coauthor of the Murray-Metcalf bill, an important forerunner of the measure we have just passed.

The Senator from Montana attended our conferences with administration representatives and was of great help to us with his wise counsel. I shall always appreciate his outstanding contribution.

Even though they did not vote with us, I wish to thank the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. All of us know that in committee work if there is an opposition that wishes to exercise all the parliamentary weapons it can keep in its parliamentary arsenal, it is sometimes very difficult to get a bill out of subcommittee to the full committee and from the full committee to the floor of the Senate.

So I appreciate the fine, sportsmanlike cooperation we received from the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] and the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], because they threw no parliamentary roadblocks, so to speak, in our way. They roughed us up from time to time in expressing opposition to our point of view, but that is to be expected and is a part of the parliamentary process. Not only is it their right, but I believe it is their duty to express themselves in opposition to a bill with which they do not agree.

I only regret that I was not more persuasive with them. I only regret that I was not a better teacher, because they are good students. Something was wrong with my teaching process, because they were not won over to my point of view. In addition, I thank them as individual members of the full committee.

Senators alone do not carry bills through committees or through the Senate. We would not be successful in the passage of any bill if it were not for the dedicated service which we receive from the very loyal staff members. I would not want the RECORD to close with my expression of thanks and gratitude to Senators only. I express very deep appreciation to the wonderful staff members on both sides of the table—both the majority and the minority staff members—who did such wonderful research and preparation work for the committee. They made it possible for us to meet the questions which were presented to us in the course of the debate on the basis of the facts as shown by the record of our hearings and deliberations.

So to John Forsythe, known to all of us as Jack, and who is general counsel of the committee, and really the right-hand assistant to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], I express in behalf of the full committee and the subcommittee my sincere thanks.

1961

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8463

Post. The editorial note in connection with the article reads as follows:

The following analysis was prepared by an administrator in the Government who prefers to remain anonymous.

Mr. President, this is a very keen analysis. It is one with which I completely agree.

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin-American Affairs, I wish to say that I believe the writer of this analysis hit the nail right on the head, so to speak. There could be a more perceptive or more sound analysis of the mistakes we have been making in Cuba. In short, I do not believe that the analysis which was published today in the Washington Post could be improved upon.

I hope that everyone in the administration who has anything to do with Cuban affairs will read the analysis and will take it to heart.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request to print the article in the RECORD?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 25, 1961]

## AN OLD MISTAKE REPEATED IN CUBA

The invasion of Cuba failed because of a misreading of the nature of revolutions, and especially of contemporary revolutions. A genuine revolution, as distinct from the military coup so common in Latin American politics, involves far-reaching social and economic change. Such change means dispossession of the former ruling class, which naturally protests loudly and violently.

But these protests represent a minority viewpoint if the revolution has effected land distribution, social services, educational opportunities, and the like. Consequently, to accept the opposition of the dispossessed as representative of the views of an entire people, or the predominant proportion of a people, is to seriously underestimate the strength and backing of a revolution.

This may seem obvious and platitudinous, and yet this underestimation has been made of every significant revolution of modern times. For example, at the Paris Peace Conference following World War I, Lloyd George opposed Allied intervention against the Bolshevik regime in Russia on the following grounds: "The peasants accepted bolshevism for the same reason that peasants accepted it in the French Revolution, namely, that it gave them land. Is any one of the Western Allies prepared to send a million men into Russia? The mere idea of crushing bolshevism by a military force is pure madness."

Yet, this madness was pursued because of the credence given to reports of emigres and diplomats that the Soviet regime had little popular support.

The invasion of Cuba failed for the same basic reason that intervention failed against the French and Russian revolutions, that is, underestimation of the popular support for a revolutionary regime.

In recent years, some French military and political leaders have studied Mao Tse-tung's military tactics and have tried unsuccessfully to apply them in Algeria. In our own country, there are reports that Che Guevara's handbook on guerrilla warfare is being used as a possible guide for U.S. forces.

One must never forget, however, that the basic strength of the guerrilla is his revolutionary program. He is identified in the mind of the peasant as one who offers relief from a despised usurer or landlord. Without such identification at the grass roots, the

guerrilla is simply a saboteur able to blow up a few installations or kill a few people, but powerless to generate widespread popular backing.

In other words, to read Che Guevara or Mao Tse-tung on guerrilla tactics and not on political and social change is to mistake technique for the underlying and determining substance.

The conclusions that may be drawn from the above are—

1. Further invasions by Cuban emigres are likely to be as futile as their first attempt. Arms from the Communist block would be part of the explanation, but by no means entirely; witness the collapse of Batista despite abundant American arms.

2. Direct American intervention will be regarded and interpreted in most of the underdeveloped and uncommitted world as corresponding to the policies of the Holy Alliance in the early 19th century. Indeed, the antagonism will be much more widespread and intense because of modern mass communication media.

3. Even if direct American intervention did not lead to international complications, it is highly probable, if not certain, that winning the battle for Cuba in this manner would mean losing the battle for Latin America. Cuba could become as serious a thorn in our side as Algeria has been for France.

Is it possible that we should talk to Castro either directly or through a third country? Is it necessary that we refrain from diplomatic trade and travel contact with Cuba?

For one reason or another, an understanding with Castro may well prove impractical. In that case we must expect the rapid development of Cuba into a Communist showplace in the Western Hemisphere. That in turn will create a situation in the Americas similar to that in Asia. Just as we now must give massive aid to India so that she will not be hopelessly surpassed by Communist China, so we will then need to give massive aid to at least certain selected Latin American countries so that they will not be surpassed by Cuba. This aid will need to be on a much larger scale than any contemplated thus far.

The basic danger in the future probably will come not from Soviet bases or Cuban agents, but from the appeal of a prosperous and growing Communist Cuban economy for the impoverished and dissatisfied Latin American peasant.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

## THE OLD SUBWAY TO THE SENATE OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I announce that one of the old trolleys in the old tunnel will continue in operation until at least the end of the present session.

## DEATH OF DAVID LYNN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, David Lynn, who served as Architect of the Capitol from 1923 to 1954, died today, after a short illness. Prior to his service as Architect, Mr. Lynn served for 22 years under the previous Architects, Edward Clark and Elliott Woods.

Mr. Lynn was appointed Architect of the Capitol by President Coolidge on August 22, 1923. He came from an old family, of Frederick and Allegany Counties, Md., who for many generations had been distinguished in the judicial, military,

business, and social life of the State. His great-great-grandfather, Judge David Lynn, was one of the three Commissioners appointed in 1751 to lay out the town of Georgetown.

Mr. Lynn was born in Wheeling, W. Va., November 10, 1873; was educated in public schools of Cumberland and the Allegany County Academy. He entered the Office of the Architect of the Capitol on July 1, 1901, during the tenure of Edward Clark as Architect. He was appointed the seventh Architect of the Capitol, following the death of Elliott Woods.

During his tenure as Architect, there were constructed and added to the buildings in the legislative and judicial groups, the New House Office Building, the First Street wing of the Senate Office Building, the U.S. Supreme Court Building, the central refrigeration plant, and other additions to the Capitol powerplant, the annex and addition to the Main Library of Congress Building, and the legislative garage.

During his tenure, the 62 acres of land lying immediately north of Constitution Avenue were acquired and developed as part of the Capitol Grounds park area; the Capitol, Senate, and House Office Buildings were completely air conditioned; the roofs over the Senate and House Wings of the Capitol were reconstructed, and the interiors of the House and Senate Chambers were remodeled; the terraces of the Capitol Building were reconstructed.

The U.S. Botanic Garden was relocated to its present site, and the new conservatory was constructed and the grounds developed under his direction.

In connection with construction projects, Mr. Lynn served as a member of the Commission for Enlarging the Capitol Grounds; the United States Supreme Court Building Commission; the Joint Commission to acquire a site and additional buildings for the Library of Congress; and was a member of the Zoning Commission of the District of Columbia and the Alley Dwelling Authority.

He served as Acting Director of the U.S. Botanic Garden, from 1934 to 1954.

Mr. Lynn retired as Architect of the Capitol on September 30, 1954. Until his death, he continued to reside at his residence, 3700 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, to consider the executive nomination on the calendar under the heading "New Report."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

## DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Brockway McMillan, of New Jersey,



8464

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 25

to be Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

## ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW, AT NOON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it adjourn, to meet on tomorrow at 12 o'clock, noon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## CALIFORNIA'S STAKE IN THE MARITIME INDUSTRY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KUCHEL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last Monday, in the city of San Francisco, I spoke at a Maritime Day luncheon. I ask unanimous consent that the comments I made on that occasion be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CALIFORNIA'S STAKE IN THE MARITIME INDUSTRY  
(Address by Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL, U.S. Senator, at the National Maritime Day Luncheon of the Propeller Club of the United States, San Francisco, Calif., Monday, May 22, 1961)

As our closest neighbor, the sea has traditionally been important to California both as a source of income and as a natural route of commerce and communication.

But, it took a war fought from two shores to open still undreamed-of maritime opportunities for us. It brought new nations into focus off our western shores. And it demonstrated to the eastern seaboard the growing industrial capability of the Pacific coast.

What has this meant for California?

It has meant the growth of a shipbuilding industry. Today, we are, indeed, a maritime State. Once content to handle repairs and conversions, we now boast 22 of the principal shipbuilding and repair yards in the country. Currently, in these yards, we are building 15 new merchant ships—one-fifth of the nationwide total under construction.

It has meant progress for our ports. Amounts of cargo handled through our harbors are increasing. During 1960, \$1¼ billion worth of goods entered our ports, one-half billion dollars through San Francisco Bay alone—a 33-percent increase over the previous years, I might add.

And proudly, we are keeping pace with the swelling demand. Our entire coast is bustling with new facilities.

In San Diego, we have a multimillion-dollar covered pier; in the East Bay, new

containerization facilities—fully automated and the most modern of its type; in Los Angeles, new passenger facilities and a container terminal; in Sacramento, an entirely new \$35 million port; in Stockton, new bulk ore and bulk grain facilities; in San Francisco, a \$50 million bond issue, to put into motion a multitude of improvements.

And pointing the way to still greater progress, plans are now underway for many improvements along our coast.

We hardly realize the wealth brought to California by the maritime industries. The ramifications are, in fact, staggering.

Building and loading ships mean employment opportunities for a highly skilled labor force. Longshore industry workers alone number some 25,000 in the State. Last year, they worked 20 million man-hours. They earned in the neighborhood of \$75 million, and about \$42 million of that here in San Francisco. Some 12,500 Californians are on the payrolls at private shipyards in the State; and, in 1960, they earned more than \$40 million. These are labor dollars that pump energy into our economy. These are dollars that purchase food and clothing, finance homes and cars, and pay taxes.

The effect on our State economy certainly does not stop here. Ships are good customers. There are a thousand and one products whose end use is found aboard American tankers, freighters and luxury liners.

Take the simple matter of light bulbs. A large freighter uses about 800 light bulbs each trip.

Or, take soap. One American line recently reported that one of its ships uses, each trip, 2,400 bars of face soap, 200 bars of lava soap, 1,200 bars of laundry soap, and 210 packages of soap powder.

Multiply this by the 1,400 American vessel arrivals in our ports. The consumption of light bulbs and soap alone is significant.

And so long as the ships continue to consume, we shall continue to supply. This goes, too, for the taxi that makes repeated trips to the docks; the retail shops that sell to the tourist and the embarking vacationer; the doctor and the lawyer who lend their talents to the maritime industry; and the banks that finance the cargo. The amount invested in ships, shoreside facilities, ship and repair yards reaches high in the millions. Shipping is, indeed, a benefactor to the economy of our State.

This is the nuclear era, the age of outer space. We are spending, as we should be, billions of dollars to reach out to the moon and to the stars. But I suggest to the American people, and to the Government, that we do not shunt the sealanes into obscurity. That great mariner of another day, Sir Walter Raleigh, was eternally correct when he said: "Whosoever commands the sea, commands the trade; howsoever commands the trade of the world, commands the riches of the world, and consequently, the world itself."

Our country, as well as our State, is dependent on the sea, for trade and commerce, for food, and for the security of our people. The seas are our road of communications with our allies and with the newly emerging states—many of which are not far away from our own shores. Across the oceans, we move 99 percent of our foreign commerce, exclusive of our contiguous neighbors, Canada and Mexico. Our foreign commerce represents 10 percent of our gross national product, now in the proximity of \$500 billion a year. And the portent for tomorrow is one of expansion. Trade will irresistibly continue and will inevitably grow.

The importance of exports cannot be overestimated. They are outlets for our industrial output. Consequently, they are an important factor in our national income. And just as significantly, they are a means of sharing our democratic way of living with new and impressionable nations.

In speaking of the importance of exports, I am delighted, at this point, to report the passage of a bill by the Senate (S. 1289), which I coauthored with Senator Magnuson. It eliminates the archaic and statutory oath requirement on shippers' export declarations. Though just one of the little things we so frequently overlook, it will save exporters thousands of unnecessary man-hours annually. It will also pare thousands of unnecessary dollars off our mounting export costs, which, unfortunately, overprice our goods in highly competitive world markets.

The sea road of commerce is two way. Over it comes the raw materials of the free world which we require for our own economic existence. Without vast imports of magnetism, bauxite, tin, rubber, nitrates, and iron ores, we could not produce steel nor aluminum. Without them, we could not fully fertilize our fields nor have a myriad of products upon which we have come to depend.

Let's not forget, either, that by buying the products of other nations we mutually strengthen the free world. A nation without outlets, particularly the single-commodity nation, is economically weak. And a nation economically weak is politically vulnerable.

In essence, our exports and imports are major tools with which we wage our defense in the cold war of economics and ideas.

American merchant ships successfully operating in peacetime trade are one of the greatest assets this Nation can possess. And because they are ready and able to serve the country at a moment's notice should the need arise, they are rightly and admirably called our fourth arm of defense. We are now living in the most dangerous world in history. Despite our fervent hopes and efforts through collective security systems to maintain a just peace, situations may suddenly develop which will demand instant response from our shipping industry. Suez and Lebanon are two recent examples.

In the Korean war, we feverishly took 600 vessels out of mothballs to supply the United Nations' needs in that conflict. But they were old and they were slow. Meanwhile, the tempo of the times was dramatically quickened. There is, I think it fair to say, an increasingly high premium on an active merchant marine, swift and sure, to play its part in peace or in emergency.

And now Russia has recognized the truth of that maxim. In 1956, the Russians stopped producing naval surface vessels in their yards and began to build merchant ships. Russia now operates about 800 merchant ships—against our 990. And, by 1965, the Russians plan to double that figure. Their dry cargo accommodations will increase 120 percent and their tanker capacity, 80 percent. In all, they will have about 13 million tons of shipping, or about 8 percent of the world total. Last year, ship construction orders around the world declined 25 percent, but the Soviet increased its demand for new tonnage by 88 percent. And, I think the importance which international communism attaches to the sealanes of the globe is devastatingly clear in her submarine fleet of more than 500—more than Hitler had in 1939.

We need only look around us to verify Soviet ambitions to penetrate all the commercial areas of the world. Ninety miles from our shore, Russian ships are arriving in Cuba every day. One hundred percent of all petroleum products are entering Cuba in Russian tankers. Russian ships call regularly at African ports. Russian ships arrive in the ports of the Persian Gulf, in the Mediterranean Sea, and in the seas of southeast Asia. It can be clearly seen that Russia, with leaping strides in merchant shipping—not to mention her undersea craft—is emphasizing the role of seapower.

It is against the background of maritime development in the Soviet bloc that we

frog the Russians in this unique development. This program—while it has shown excellent progress in the past 5 years—had received only skimpy support from the previous administration.

Yet, this Nation pioneered atomic science and is in a position now to lead the way and be the indisputable leader of atomic space travel. The President's recommendation is an important step in this direction. I applaud him for his stand, and I am most hopeful that his appeal will be favorably received by the Congress.

Furthermore, President Kennedy, in my judgment, made a necessary and frank disclosure of America's standing in the cold war. His message concerning the dedication of our Nation to liberty and freedom cannot be repeated too often, nor can we overstress the sacrifices which each of us must be willing to take for the security of the country.

The modernization of our Armed Forces and the buildup of conventional military power to contain communism is a vital step toward achieving real security in this country. I am happy to see that the President has taken vigorous action to institute these reforms in our military posture.

All Americans, I believe, can draw inspiration from the intelligent and concise statement by the President of the goals that motivate this country and what is needed and should be expected of us all if liberty is to prevail in this world. It is my hope that Congress will see fit to assist the program of the President by appropriate legislative action.

#### DOLLAR GAPSMANSHIP

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed into the RECORD a report which was prepared for me on the possible adverse affect of the administration's proposal to cut from \$500 to \$100 the amount of goods returning to the United States which tourists can bring in duty free.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. "dollar gapmanship" could backfire on both our balance of trade and our Latin American relations in several key areas.

Back in February, President Kennedy proposed to cut from \$500 to \$100 the amount of goods returning U.S. tourists can bring in duty-free. The \$500 limit was originally set to help European economies back onto their feet. That was in the days when U.S. attention was focused on European recovery. Now administration leaders feel that Europe no longer needs help—and we need the tourists' dollars here.

But Mr. Kennedy's proposal—now formalized into H.R. 6811 just passed by the House—has poked a stick into the hornet's nest of Latin American and Caribbean economies. For the \$500 tourist exemption has been a boon to south-of-the-border nations hungry to earn American tourist dollars.

Thus, amid general satisfaction with the \$500 million Alliance for Progress Latin American aid bill, a discordant note was slipped into the May 15 session of the Economic Commission for Latin America. The ECLA pointed out "foreign exchange income from tourism is of vital importance for the economy of some countries of the Latin

American region." They called on member states "to avoid measures which may jeopardize" the flow of tourists. The finger was pointed squarely at Uncle Sam.

To see why our hemispheric neighbors are so concerned, focus on Curacao, largest of the Netherlands Antilles. Curacao—just off the coast of Venezuela—long depended on oil refining to give it the highest standard of living in the Caribbean. With free world oil markets shrinking, Curacaoans have been counting on tourist-generated dollars to finance a new Economic Development Plan. This plan will free the island of a one-industry economy. More important is the fact that tourism is Curacao's second largest industry right now. Increasing numbers of Americans have been going to the capital city and free port of Willemstad for bargains offered by Curacao's globe-circling merchants. Several thousand Curacaoans are dependent on a tourist industry built by attracting these bargain hunters.

Despite the growing number of American tourists coming to Curacao, islanders point out the United States gets the better end of the trade. For every dollar laid out by American tourists, six dollars are spent in the United States by Curacaoans, about \$250 for every man, woman, and child.

In addition to the all-important oil shipments, each year Curacao brings in \$29 million of such staple American goods as Detroit cars, Louisville refrigerators, Kansas grain, and Philadelphia air conditioners. The Dutch Antilles together import about \$70 million of U.S. goods each year.

These imports from the States dwarf the \$5 million American tourists paid out in 1959 during their shopping tours through Curacao—generally regarded as the favorite shopping center of the tax-free Caribbean.

Curacao is thus most susceptible to the Kennedy measure. The island's Director of Economic Affairs and Development, Dr. F. P. Jansen, points out that local tourism is not "residual". Eighty-seven percent of tourist dollars are spent for goods—not hotels and services.

The proposed 80 percent cut in the tourist allowance means many of the Curacaoans now directly employed in the tourist industry may find themselves out of work. Spritzer & Fuhrmann, largest jewelry and silver merchant there, says large scale layoffs will be inevitable among their 600 employees.

With the island's second largest industry threatened and with the underpinnings of their Economic Development Plan weakened, Curacaoans are joining others in Latin America in regarding the Kennedy measure as an unreasoned or unfriendly act. They wonder if this is the United States' answer to years of friendship and heavy purchases from the North American giant.

As one leading Curacao figure exclaimed, "It makes little sense for the United States to adopt tourist policies that may bankrupt us, and then proceed to put us on American relief."

*Cuba file*  
THE DRIVE TO RANSOM CASTRO CAPTIVES NEEDS HELP

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on the floor of the Senate last evening I made a brief statement in support of the effort by our fellow Americans to raise funds in an attempt to secure the freedom of 1,200 Castro prisoners. My statement yesterday contained my reasons for taking this position. However, at this time I would like to ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the body of the RECORD an editorial from the May 23 edition of the Providence Journal, "The Drive To Ransom Castro Captives Needs Help." It is my belief that this editorial states eloquently the reasons why the citizens of

this, the world's greatest democracy, have an obligation to help liberate the unfortunate Cuban freedom fighters imprisoned by Premier Castro.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Providence Journal, May 23, 1961]

#### THE DRIVE TO RANSOM CASTRO CAPTIVES NEEDS HELP

The voluntary campaign to raise \$2 million dollars to buy the 500 tractors demanded by Premier Castro as the ransom price for the release of nearly 1,200 imprisoned Cuban rebels calls for the unstinting support of Americans.

Despite the raw cynicism of Castro's proposal, despite the distaste for a payoff to a blackmailer, the fate of the 1,200 captured anti-Castro invaders takes precedence over pride or protocol.

For many reasons, the American Government cannot participate officially in Castro's cruel game of pawns. The lives of human beings, whom Castro has condemned to what would be slave labor unless they are ransomed, cannot be equated with any number of tractors. People are not commodities to be traded, so many irreplaceable individuals for so many replaceable things—whether dollars, tractors, or trucks, the commodity that Hitler demanded to spare the lives of a million Hungarian Jews.

Although the Government has paid ransom in the past to win freedom for American citizens unjustly jailed behind the Iron Curtain, Castro's proffered deal is different in many respects. The 1,200 hostages are not American citizens. Nor are they mercenaries, as Cuban propagandists claim. They were not "bought" in the first instance to undertake to overthrow Castro, but rather were patriots, many former comrades in revolutionary arms with Castro, seeking to save their Nation from Fidelista dictatorship of the Left just as they sought before to end the military dictatorship of Batista. By the same token, this Government is precluded from taking any active role in a "trade" that would suggest Washington regards the rebel survivors now as mercenaries salvageable for a price.

But these philosophical and official considerations do not have to inhibit Americans as individuals. By their response to the fundraising appeal of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, Walter Reuther and Dr. Milton Eisenhower for Cuba's freedom fighters, private American citizens can demonstrate to the world that this country's vaunted concern for humanity, for individual human beings, is more than an empty phrase, more than a demagogic lure.

Indeed, there is an obligation of sorts on Americans to render what assistance they can as individuals to the imprisoned anti-Castro force. The American Government, which acts in the name of the people, has acknowledged a responsibility extending over both the present and past administrations for the failure of the Cuban rebel invasion.

The American people can make amends to the anti-Castro volunteers for whatever mistakes Washington made in its covert support of the invasion by helping to redeem at least the lives of the survivors. As distasteful as political blackmail is, the fundraising effort also gives the American people an occasion to demonstrate their friendship for the Cuban people, as distinct from the regime.

The need for funds will not stop, however, with the ransom price of 500 tractors. The men who risked their lives in the ill-starred anti-Castro invasion cannot simply be left back on the beach at Florida. As soldiers sharing this country's concern with keeping the New World free, they like the

Hungarian freedom fighters have earned the help of Americans—and that means all of us—in finding jobs and accommodations until they can return to Cuba as free men. Any money over the \$2 million required for the tractors could be applied very usefully to that end.

#### TRIBUTE TO MINORITY STAFF MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Today a compliment was paid to the staff of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and I think particularly to the majority members of the staff. I certainly concur in that compliment, because they have been kind, they have been courteous, they have been attentive, and they have been cooperative on every occasion. But I wish to pay an extraordinary compliment to the minority members of the staff, Michael Bernstein, Ray Hurley, George Wray, John Stringer, Thelma Blankenship, and Carmel Giancola.

Never have I seen more devoted staff members. Never have they put in such long hours, to make sure that the minority members of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee had all the information properly digested. So today I salute them as a great staff, who have been extremely helpful on every occasion, in preparing the minority views and in exploring every other view with respect not only to the instant legislation but to all the legislation which comes before that committee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I join the distinguished minority leader in his compliments to the minority staff. When the vote is concluded, I shall take 2 or 3 minutes to express my appreciation to many others.

#### SCHOOL ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1021) to authorize a program of Federal financial assistance for education.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the last sentence in the "Declaration of purpose" of this bill reads:

It is the intent of Congress that with this assistance the quality of public elementary and secondary education will be substantially improved in all States and that inequalities of educational opportunities within and between States will be substantially reduced.

In line with this policy, proponents of the bill have repeated that the real purpose of the bill is to provide equality of educational opportunity.

As is the case with so much legislation that is being proposed, one must look beyond the nice-sounding labels and lofty objectives set forth, and carefully

examine the words of the particular bill under consideration to see whether in fact there has been some mislabeling; to see whether the lofty objectives will really be achieved.

Here we have a bill that is supposed to attain equality of educational opportunity for boys and girls attending public primary and secondary schools throughout the United States. How is this to be done? The answer provided by the bill is, in a nutshell, to spend \$850 million a year. Nothing is said about how it is to be spent. In fact, the proponents of this bill have repeated time and again the policy set forth in section 103 of the bill; namely:

In the administration of [the act] no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

I respectfully submit that this policy kills the purpose of the bill. Anyone in the education field will tell us that spending money is not enough; that to achieve even minimal quality of education there must be standards.

There are considerable differences in the standards established in the laws of the 50 States; and within each State there are vast differences in standards among the hundreds and thousands of school districts. Just spending more money will not assure equality of educational opportunity. Sooner or later, the standards will have to be changed. Three years from now, if the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare means what he says, the Congress will be asked for a continuing annual Federal appropriation. We will not have attained equality of educational opportunity in the meantime, and if the proponents of this legislation are consistent, they will say that we must appropriate even more money than this bill calls for. Their only answer to the problem will be to spend more Federal money, and as long as this philosophy prevails, we will never achieve equality of educational opportunity. The answer to the problem of providing equality of educational opportunity in fact lies in the provision of minimal Federal standards—not in the spending of more Federal money. I think the proponents of this legislation know this, but they are afraid to include standards in this bill because they know that the people do not want the Federal Government telling them how to run their schools. They know that once Federal money comes into the States and local school districts, it will be more difficult for the people to resist imposition of Federal standards and controls.

As I have said on this floor before, I think the Senate should make up its mind what it wants to do. Either it should decide to spend millions of dollars of Federal money in a program which can never achieve equality of educational opportunity; or it should decide to include in the bill the standards that will achieve this equality. It has already decided against amendments, which I supported, to return to the

States some of the revenue raised within their own borders from their own citizens to enable them to have the wherewithal to spend more money in accordance with their own standards. To me, the choice is now quite clear. A vote for this bill will be a vote to spend millions of dollars for a lofty purpose which, under this bill, will never be achieved. A vote against the bill will result in a new bill being introduced which will either actually achieve equality of educational opportunity in fact or will return to the States the revenue needed for them to fulfill their responsibilities of education in accordance with standards which their people believe to be adequate.

Another aspect of this bill which troubles me greatly is that it will result in thousands of local school budgets being drawn up on the assumption that future appropriations by Congress will be forthcoming. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has made it clear that this is what he has in mind. Some of the proponents of this legislation may feel the same way, but they are strangely silent on this point. I view with alarm such a fatalistic assumption that the State and local governments can nevermore be relied upon to fulfill their traditional role in the education of their citizens.

I am equally alarmed over the tenuousness of such an assumption. It is entirely possible, if not probable, that future appropriations will not be forthcoming. And when that situation arises, the budgets of thousands of local school districts will literally be wrecked. Such would not be true if this legislation were limited to assistance for construction. But the bill has now been amended to cover all kinds of operating costs as well.

The logical result of this type of legislation is that under the general welfare clause of the Constitution, which the proponents of this bill rely upon as the basis therefore, it will only be a matter of time before the Federal Government will come up with Federal aid for operating costs of our mental hospitals—because, it can be argued, the Federal Government has an interest in the mental health of the Nation; and then Federal aid for operating expenses of our State colleges and universities—because, it can be argued, the Federal Government has an interest in the higher education of our young people; and then Federal aid for State prisons—because, it can be argued, the Federal Government has an interest in rehabilitation of prisoners so that they will become useful citizens; and so on. Not that these objectives are unsound. Not that the Federal Government should not be "interested" or "concerned." But this is the way toward the usurpation of all governmental functions by one, centralized, Federal Government and the destruction of our Republic.

Finally, Mr. President, our President has just called upon the Congress for action to appropriate more money—billions of dollars of it—for national defense and space activities. In the course



I will admit that the statistics relating to classroom and teacher shortages are open to question. Yet we must have some basis upon which to justify this program. I shall accept the figures offered by the U.S. Office of Education.

In 1953, the Commissioner of Education reported a shortage of 312,000 classrooms. A year later this estimate rose to 370,000 with predictions that further increases in the classroom shortage were expected. While these statistics were being compiled, the States managed to construct classrooms at an average rate of almost 70,000 per year, thus exceeding the goal set by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. By the fall of 1960, the classroom shortage had been reduced to 142,100.

In order to offset this magnificent record, proponents of this bill contend that the States cannot continue to finance the educational needs of the 1960's and therefore Federal aid is essential. Once again, the record reveals otherwise as the taxpayers of America continue to approve school bonds to improve educational facilities. But, even if we accept this contention, this bill offers no relief. In order to receive its full entitlement, each State must maintain a minimum effort based on the average State effort over the three preceding fiscal years.

This simply means that the States must maintain their present level of progress. I believe they will meet their educational needs without the coercion of the Federal Government and notwithstanding the pessimism of those who support this bill.

In staffing our public schools, the States have also proven their ability to proceed without Federal Aid. Since 1900, public school enrollment increased by 140 percent while the number of teachers rose by 250 percent. We now have one teacher per 24.4 pupils whereas in 1900 one teacher served 35.6 pupils. At the same time teachers' salaries have more than kept pace with those of other wage earners. Again, the record fails to justify Federal intervention.

In praising the States for their efforts in meeting the educational needs of the Nation, I take special pride in the progress made in my own State of Maryland. Since 1950, the number of pupils in Maryland public schools has increased by 70 percent while the number of teachers increased by 90 percent. During this same period, teachers' salaries have been increased by 63.8 percent. Maryland's average salary of classroom teachers is now \$5,680 per year. Maryland thus ranks 11th in the Nation in the payment of teachers. We are spending \$415 per pupil in average daily attendance. This is above the national average and represents an increase of 86.9 percent during the past 10 years.

It has not been easy for Maryland to meet these educational needs. It will not be easy for us to meet future needs. But we are prepared to meet them—that is, if the Federal Government will hold the line and not require Maryland taxpayers to finance a national program which will cost \$1 for every 75 cents received from Washington.

I have no illusions that this bill will be defeated nor that it will be improved by the adoption of worthy amendments. Nevertheless, I deem it to be the duty of those who oppose S. 1021 to point out the shortcomings of this bill and support amendments to improve the bill. It has been implied, during the debate, that opponents of the bill should not offer amendments if they are not prepared to support the final product. I sincerely hope that the time will never arrive when any Senator must forfeit his right to amend pending legislation merely because he intends to oppose final passage of the legislation.

Accepting the fact that this bill will pass, I wish to comment on some of the more glaring inequities and shortcomings of S. 1021.

Returning to the declaration of purpose, we find it to be the intent of Congress that "inequalities of educational opportunities within and between States will be substantially reduced." This bill endorses a principle of equal opportunity in education while permitting Federal funds to be used to support segregated schools—an actively clearly in violation of the Constitution.

An amendment to prohibit such use of Federal funds was rejected by the proponents of S. 1021 on the grounds that it was not germane to this bill and that it would jeopardize the benefits which would accrue to the little boys and girls of America. I would remind the proponents of this bill that there are thousands of Negro boys and girls who are entitled to equal educational opportunities. It is about time that we stop treating the Negro as a problem unrelated to the issues which affect the American people. It is about time that we lay aside the cloak of expediency and give something more than lip service to those principles which we claim to endorse.

I sincerely believe that Government should not do for the people that which the people can do for themselves. I believe that Government which is closest to the people is best. For these reasons, I am opposed to shifting the responsibility for educating our youth from the local school districts to the States or the Federal Government.

None of us are so naive as to believe that the program we initiate today will end after the expiration of 3 years. On the contrary, this is just the beginning. As the program progresses, it will be necessary to set additional standards and controls. Ultimately, the Federal Government will assume the responsibility for educating our youth. If I may engage in the game of foretelling the future, I predict that it will not be long before we are asked to approve the establishment of a Department of Education.

I oppose this shift of responsibility. I do not share the lack of faith and trust of those who contend that the parents of America will not demand and provide the best possible education for their children.

Finally, I would address myself to titles II and III of S. 1021, which extend Public Laws 815 and 874. If we are to

talk about germaneness, then I submit that these titles have no place in this bill. The impacted areas legislation was not enacted to improve the educational standards of this Nation. Rather, the purpose of these laws is to compensate the States for land taken off the tax rolls by the Federal Government. If not for these Federal activities, this land would represent a lucrative source of revenue far in excess of the payments now being received. I support the continuation of these programs. However, I shall not trade my vote on this issue, important as it may be, for the acceptance of a Federal aid program which I know to be unjustified and inherently wrong.

Federal aid to education is not a new concept. It has come before the Congress periodically since 1871. Each time voices of pessimism warned of the collapse of our educational system. Each time these warnings were proved to be wrong as the States met current needs with positive action. I am confident that the needs of the future will be met by the States with equal determination.

#### *Cuba file* CASTRO'S CIVILIAN PRISONERS

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MCGEE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, last night there occurred a colloquy on the floor of the Senate between the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] and myself about the anti-Castro fighters for whom a private U.S. committee is negotiating to free. During the colloquy I suggested that perhaps in addition to taking whatever action was advisable on the military prisoners, in line with a humanitarian viewpoint we ought to give some thought to the 150,000 political prisoners who now languish in Cuban jails.

It seemed to me at that time, as we were discussing the subject on the floor of the Senate, that whatever action was taken by a private group, more intelligent and effective action could be taken by either a committee of the United Nations or a committee of the Organization of American States or by the International Red Cross or by any other group or mechanism which could help free some of the larger group of people who are being held as political prisoners in the prisons of Cuba.

I read from a New York Times editorial of today, May 25, entitled "Castro's Civilian Prisoners." I will read only a section of the editorial. It is vitally important:

While international efforts are being made for the release of over 1,200 military prisoners in Cuba, the world must not forget the civilians incarcerated by Premier Fidel Castro's regime.

Newsman have estimated that 200,000 men and women were rounded up after the unsuccessful landing in April.

Think of that, Mr. President. If the news report is true, 200,000 men and women were rounded up.

Exiles talk of 5,000 persons penned in a 150-seat theater in Havana, 19 dying the first day. Relatives in many cases have

been unable to learn whether vanished kin are in custody. Only slowly have any of those confined in the latest roundup been winning release. Other political prisoners are reported to have been held without trial for months. Summary executions have been rumored.

There was a time when Fidel Castro was himself a rebel against the Fulgencio Batista government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the colloquy which occurred on the floor of the Senate between the Senator from Florida and myself.

There being no objection, the colloquy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield to me?

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I do not have the floor.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I have the floor; and I ask unanimous consent that the colloquy may continue, but that time required for it be not charged to the time available to either side, under the unanimous-consent agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, this is a very important subject. I know the able Senator from Florida has studied it very carefully. Will he inform us as nearly as he is able to, based on what he has been able to learn from the press and in other ways, how many prisoners are being held in Cuba, today, by Castro?

Mr. SMATHERS. Over and above the so-called freedom fighters?

Mr. CARROLL. Yes, the 1,200.

Mr. SMATHERS. Over and above the 1,271, my information is—although I cannot vouch for its authenticity—that in the neighborhood of 100,000 people are being held.

Mr. CARROLL. A few days ago I read in the newspapers that the estimated number was 147,000. However, whether it be 100,000 or 50,000—

Mr. SMATHERS. The information is that on the night of the revolution, Castro picked up 147,000 or 157,000. Since then, approximately 50,000 have been released; but 100,000 are still incarcerated in theaters and in pens of all kinds, under the most terrible conditions imaginable.

Mr. CARROLL. In order to be conservative, let us say that the number still held by Castro is only 50,000. But regardless of the exact number of prisoners Castro still holds, certainly the negotiations are most important, for they involve thousands of people. So if the Government of the United States has to negotiate on this basis, let the negotiations be across the board.

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not disagree with the Senator. I merely say I do not think the Government, itself, is in a position to become involved in this particular matter. The whole burden of what I was trying to say is that citizens' groups do a much more effective job. I understand the Government has taken no particular position with respect to this question, and I hope that will continue to be the case; but I agree that we ought to try to have every prisoner in Cuba released, and, for that matter, anywhere else. There are three boys in Ecuador who need to be released.

Mr. CARROLL. Would the Senator not say that, if we are to negotiate for 1,271 prisoners, we should talk about all the people who are now in prisons, whether it be done by private groups, or by a commission of the Government, or by the U.S. Government?

Mr. SMATHERS. I could not disagree with the Senator. Certainly, we want to see that all people who are incarcerated wrongly are freed. Certainly, there are some in Cuba.

Certainly, if we are to try to free 1,200, we ought to try to free more. Certainly, we should try to free Cuba. Certainly, we should try to get rid of communism there.

Mr. CARROLL. Emphasis has been placed on some 1,200 people. Some persons call it a ransom, some call it blackmail, to exchange machines for men. What about the thousands who languish in the jails of Cuba? It seems to me, they also represent a proper basis for negotiation.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial which appeared in the New York Times may be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### CASTRO'S CIVILIAN PRISONERS

While international efforts are being made for the release of over 1,200 military prisoners in Cuba, the world must not forget the civilians incarcerated by Premier Fidel Castro's regime.

Newsmen have estimated that 200,000 men and women were rounded up after the unsuccessful landing in April. Exiles talk of 5,000 persons penned in a 150-seat theater in Havana, 19 dying the first day. Relatives in many cases have been unable to learn whether vanished kin are in custody. Only slowly have any of those confined in the latest roundup been winning release. Other political prisoners are reported to have been held without trial for months. Summary executions have been rumored.

There was a time when Fidel Castro was himself a rebel against the Fulgencio Batista government.

Then Dr. Castro was declaring in a broadcast of August 21, 1958: "The victories we have won in arms, without murdering, torturing, or even questioning the enemy, show that attacking human dignity can never be justified."

Then he was arguing: "If in any war cruelty is stupid, it never is so much so as in a civil war, where the fighters will have to live together some day and the victors will find themselves before the children, wives, and mothers of the victims."

Then he was insisting: "The example that our combatants are giving must be held up as an edifying stimulus for our future generations, as against the shameful and depressing examples given by the murderers and torturers of the dictatorship."

In those rebel days, Fidel Castro was calling for the International Committee of the Red Cross to take over prisoners and to provide medicines. He was proud that on July 24, 1958, his rebels had released 253 captured Batista troops to an International Red Cross delegate, and 169 more to the Cuban Red Cross a few days later.

This would be the time once again to invoke the International Red Cross—or an inter-American governmental committee or a United Nations mission—to alleviate conditions of detainees, to report lists to families, to press for respect for the universal declaration of human rights.

Article 9 of that declaration states: "No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention, or exile." Article 10 says: "Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him."

This should be a cause for the United States and the governments of the Western Hemisphere, in particular, as well as for those governments that sought so ardently for human rights for the late Premier Patrice Lumumba of the Congo. If Dr. Castro

should see fit to regard the International Red Cross in the same humanitarian light as he did his own revolt, it would be an advance for human rights—and for Cuba.

Mr. CARROLL. I wish to read again briefly from the editorial. After outlining three or four important factors, it states:

This would be the time once again to invoke the international Red Cross—or an inter-American governmental committee or a United Nations mission—to alleviate conditions of detainees, to report lists to families, to press for respect for the universal declaration of human rights.

Article 9 of the declaration states: "No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest, detention, or exile." Article 10 says: "Everyone is entitled in full equality to a fair and public hearing by an independent and impartial tribunal, in the determination of his rights and obligations and of any criminal charge against him."

I do not profess to be an expert in these matters, but it seems to me that the purport of the editorial and the discussion we had the other night is nothing more than the application of commonsense. The President said that he looks upon these men as brothers. Are the 150,000 people who languish in jails anything less than our brothers and sisters?

Therefore, when we talk about this private group functioning, I say let them go ahead. Let them exchange tractors. However, I advocate we take an additional step, but not by private groups. I advocate that through the Organization of American States or through the United Nations or through an international organization like the Red Cross, an immediate, continuing and unrelenting effort be made to free the 150,000 civilian prisoners who languish in jails in Cuba. Let us hear an answer from Castro on this to the people of Latin America. Let him attempt to answer it to the peoples of the world.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. McGEE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish at this time to make only two comments on the President's message. The first is to remark on the extraordinary range of subjects which he discussed. There is scarcely an aspect of our national security that did not receive attention in the course of his address; yet no one could say that his remarks were disparate or unrelated to a sense of the totality of the struggle that faces us.

I can recall few speeches in the past decades that have more clearly and forcefully demonstrated the complexity of the issues before us, or the interdependence of our foreign and domestic responsibilities.

My second comment is that the President showed throughout his address his profound sense of optimism that we can expect to meet the great changes before us. I share his optimism, and I honor him for his faith in Congress and in the